



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/566,965

08/19/2006

Christophe Dumousseaux

09354.0009

9332

22852

7590

04/14/2009

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

SOROUGH, LAYLA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1617

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/14/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/566,965	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DUMOUSSEAU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> LAYLA SOROUGH	<b>Art Unit</b> 1617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 and 12-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 11, 2008. Claims 1-10, and 12-14 are pending.

The following new rejections are made:

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadokura et al. (EP 268 938 – previously presented) in view of Hall et al. (US 20020009564 A1), and Mongiat et al. (US 7,101,536 – previously presented).

Kadokura et al. teach cosmetic compositions such as make-up formulations comprising a lamina comprising a matrix substance (e.g. silicon dioxide) and a finely divided metal or metal compound dispersed therein (e.g. titanium dioxide, zinc oxide, silver powder, etc.). See p. 2, lines 36-45, 56-58; p. 3, lines 1-49; p. 5, lines 25-29; p. 9, Example 10. The average thickness of the lamina is 0.1-5 microns, the average size is

Art Unit: 1617

1-500 microns and the aspect ratio is 3-100. See p. 4, line 53 – p. 5, line 5. The lamina of Kadokura are calcined at ranges between 300 C to 700 C. The same silicon base porous particles are taught therefore, the property of “aspect ratio” claimed is met by the teachings of the prior art.

Hall et al. is solely used to show that silicone particles calcined at about 300 C to about 400 C, produce porous particles (col 3 lines 25-40).

Kadokura et al. does not teach the spherical powder of Claims 11 and 12.

However, Mongiat et al. teach using spherical powders of the instant claims as SPF enhancers in UV protective compositions. See col. 31, lines 40-47. An additional beneficial effect provided by some spherical powders is a soft feel during spreading and skin mattifying. See col. 31, lines 50-55.

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the UV protective compositions of Kadokura et al. such that to use spherical powders. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to obtain better UV protection as well as to improve the skin feel and mattifying properties of cosmetic formulations as suggested by Mongiat et al.

With respect to Claim 7, the reference teaches. nanoparticles of metal or metal compounds such as silver powder, titanium dioxide and other substance, dispersed within the matrix particles (see above), but does not explicitly teach the claimed “combination of silver nanoparticles and titanium dioxide nanoparticles”. However, making a combination of the disclosed compounds is obvious modification of the prior

Art Unit: 1617

art and within the skill of the ordinary practitioner. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to obtain the desired UV screening ability of the lamina.

With respect to Claim 10, the reference does not teach the claimed oil absorbability of the particles. However, since the particles of Kadokura et al. are porous and are used in skin care formulations such as face powder and foundations, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the oil absorbability of the particles. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to obtain a mattifying effect of the formulations.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadokura et al. (EP 268 938) and Mongiat et al. (US 7,101,536 – previously presented), as applied to claims 1-5, 7-13 and 14 above, and further in view of Reinehr et al. (WO 01/43714).

Kadokura et al. and Mongiat et al. are as applied above.

Kadokura et al. and Mongiat et al. do not teach the fluorescent substances of Claim 6.

However, Reinehr et al. teach using fluorescent substances of the instant claim in UV protecting skin care compositions. See Abstract; pp. 1-11. The fluorescent substances are used to lighten the skin, to protect the skin against UV radiation and to improve the appearance of cosmetic formulations. See pp. 1, 17.

Art Unit: 1617

Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the particles of Kadokura et al. such that to use fluorescent substances in addition to or instead of metal oxides dispersed in the matrix. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to obtain UV protective and skin lightening effect as well as to improve the appearance of cosmetic formulations as suggested by Reinehr et al.

### ***Response to Arguments***

In respect to Applicant's arguments filed on February 29, 2008 have been considered but are not fully persuasive.

Applicant argues the Kadokura et al. reference fails to teach porous particles. Examiner states that Hall et al. teaches silicone particles calcined at about 300 C to about 400 C, produce porous particles.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Examiner states that Mongiat et al. was solely relied upon due to the teaching that spherical powders of the instant claims as SPF enhancers in UV protective compositions. See col. 31, lines 40-47. An additional beneficial effect provided by some spherical powders is a soft feel

Art Unit: 1617

during spreading and skin mattifying. See col. 31, lines 50-55. Also, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the particles of Kadokura et al. such that to use fluorescent substances in addition to or instead of metal oxides dispersed in the matrix. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to obtain UV protective and skin lightening effect as well as to improve the appearance of cosmetic formulations as suggested by Reinehr et al.

Applicant submits that the use of porous particles provides surprising advantages which could not have been predicted from the prior art. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are not persuasive. The comparative data does not commensurate in scope because the comparison has not been made with respect to the prior art relied upon. Unless comparison is made with disclosure identical (not similar) with that of the reference, affidavits or declarations comparing applicant's results with those of the prior art have no probative value. Additionally, the Examiner states the silicon base porous particles are taught by Kadokura.

### *Conclusion*

No claims allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Layla Soroush whose telephone number is (571)272-5008. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Art Unit: 1617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreenivasan Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/SREENI PADMANABHAN/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1617